Remarks

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the review of the present application.

In the Claims

Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 14-23 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 14-23 are rejected. Claims 1, 19, 21 and 23 have been amended. Claim 18 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 USC §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6-10, 14-17 and 21-23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,973,481 issued to Thompson et al. ("Thompson") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0220717 issued to Underwood et al. ("Underwood"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants herein amend independent claims 1, 21 and 23 to include the limitation of original claim 18. Claim 19 has been amended to change the dependency such that the claim is now dependent on claim 1. No new matter has been added. As claim 18 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of Underwood and in further view of Tucker, based on the amendments made herein, Applicants address this rejection together with the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-10, 14-17 and 21-23 under 35 USC §103(a) over Thompson in view of Underwood.

Thompson in view of Underwood and in further view of Tucker fail to disclose all of the elements required by claims 1, 21 and 23. Additionally, Thompson, Underwood and Tucker are not analogous art. However, assuming *arguendo*, even if Thompson and Underwood were

combined with Tucker, the resulting combination still fails to disclose all of the elements required by claims 1, 21 and 23.

Applicants herein incorporate their comments made in their previous responses including those made in their response dated August 26, 2010. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection of independent claims 1, 21 and 23 over Thompson in view of Underwood, however, in the interest of furthering prosecution; Applicants have amended claims 1, 21 and 23 herein.

The current Office action states that "Applicant also argues that Underwood fails to show an input sensor for measuring source water entering…Applicant seems to be stating that the sensed opening (or closing) of the valve is not a related to the source water". See Office action dated April 8, 2011, page 10. However, Applicants stated:

> Thompson in view of Underwood fail to disclose at least an input sensor for measuring source water entering the water purification device as required by claims 1, 21 and 23 and therefore, even if combined and modified as suggested by the Office action, Thompson in view of Underwood fail to render claims 1, 21 and 23 unpatentable." See Applicants response dated August 26, 2010, page 7. Applicants further stated that "Underwood teaches an "influent valve 202 prior to entry into a filter bed 206…the influent valve 202 controls the flow of water from the WATER SOURCE to the filter bed 206. The level of water in the filter bed 206 can be ascertained by a level sensor 208". See Underwood, [0025], lines 2-5 and 11-14. Underwood further states that "the state of a valve may be ascertained by a sensor monitoring an actuator coupled to a valve". See Underwood, [0035], lines 204. Underwood's influent valve is either "open", allowing flow, or is "closed", preventing flow, and thus may either allow influent or not. It is not possible for Underwood's influent valve to provide any measurement of source water. Underwood's influent valve, as stated by Underwood, "controls the flow of water into the system". There is no teaching, suggestion or motivation that, based on the position of the influent valve, i.e., based on whether the valve is open or closed, "the amount of water entering the purification device is known" as suggested by the Office action.
>
> Further, there is no motivation in Underwood to alter this influent valve 202 to "calculate efficiency of the water purification (generation) device", as suggested in the Office action. See Office action dated February 26, 2010, pages 9-10. Underwood clearly discloses that the influent valve controls the flow of water from the WATER SOURCE to the filter bed 206. Further, Underwood states that the "level of water in the filter bed 206 can be ascertained by a level sensor 208". No where in Underwood is the volume of treated water measured,

> nor any discussion, suggestion or teaching set forth to ascertain either the volume of water flowing into the system nor the volume purified. Thus, there is no motivation to modify the influent valve of Underwood to become a means for calculating efficiency of the water purification (generation) device. Further, if the influent valve 202 were modified as suggested in the Office action, it would no longer function as an "on" or "off" valve and therefore, would cease to perform as indicated and required by Underwood. "

See Applicants response dated August 26, 2010. For at least these reasons, Applicants believe claims 1, 21 and 23 are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Thompson in view of Underwood.

Furthermore, with respect to the rejection of the subject matter of claim 18 in further view of Tucker, the Office action states that Tucker teaches a self-locating device having an output indicative of the location of the monitoring system, citing Tucker at col. 12, lines 47-66. The Office action states that it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a GPS component as done in Tucker into the monitoring system of Thompson further modified by Underwood. The Office action further states that the motivation to combine is using GPS systems can increase precision and reduce errors, citing Tucker at col. 1, line 63- col. 2, line 10. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Firstly, Tucker discloses an electronic control system and valves for use with irrigation systems. See Tucker, col. 5, lines 13-17. Tucker discloses that "by regulating discharge pressure from an end-gun on a center-pivot, the throw radius and discharge of the end-gun can be controllably adjusted in order to compensate for changes in field area that is irrigated by the end-gun. Controller 38 can be configured to generate signals that are choreographed with a determined location for the center-pivot within the field, such as by utilizing inputs from an electronic compass or global positioning satellite (GPS) system as inputs to controller 38. An appropriate signal would be sent to the controller based on the detected position of the center-

pivot, thereby providing input information that can determine a desired throw radius and discharge for the end-gun". See Tucker, col. 12, lines 53-65. Thus, Tucker fails to disclose "a self-locating device having an output indicative of the location of the water purification device" as required by claims 1, 21 and 23. Rather, Tucker discloses using a GPS system such that the controller can determine the location for the center-pivot within the field . Thus, even if Thompson in view of Underwoods and further in view of Tucker were combined, as suggested in the Office action, the result fails to include all of the limitations as required by claims 1, 21 and 23.

Further, Tucker, Thompson and Underwood are not analogous art. The Office action states that Thompson as modified by Underwood and Tucker are analogous art because both are directed to the same field of endeavor of supplying a utility product. See Office action, page 9. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Thompson discloses a system for providing electrical-power to remote communities widely distributed over an extended geographical area (See Thompson, abstract). Underwood discloses a water filter system comprising a control system, communication means, piping, actuates, sensors and valves (See Underwood, abstract). Tucker discloses a fluid delivery and control system for a fluid delivery line having elastic components (See Tucker, abstract). Thus, while Thompson discloses art in the field of electrical-power distribution and Underwood discloses a water treatment system, Tucker discloses art in the field of fluid delivery and control systems for a fluid delivery line. These three are non analogous and therefore cannot be relied upon in the current rejection.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants believe claims 1, 21 and 23 are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Thompson in view of Underwood and in further view of

Tucker. Further Applicants believe claims 2-4, 6-10, 14-17, 19-20 and 22 are allowable as these claims depend from a base claim which has been shown to be allowable. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-10, 14-17, 19-22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Thompson in view of Underwood and further in view Tucker.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons all of the claims of the present invention are patentable over the art of record. It is believed that all of the claim rejections have been addressed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and issuance of a notice of allowance are respectfully requested. If any matter arises which may expedite issuance of a notice of allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned, at the telephone number given below.

Applicants request that $930.00 be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-4383 to cover the fee for the Request for Continued Examination.

Applicants believe that a three-month extension of time is required and hereby petition for a three-month extension of time. Applicants request that the associated extension fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-4383. Applicants also request that any other fee required for timely consideration of this application be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-4383.

Date: October 11, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/Michelle Saquet Temple/

Michelle Saquet Temple
Registration No. 48,834
Attorney for Applicants

DEKA Research & Development Corp.
340 Commercial Street
Manchester, NH 03101-1129
Tel: (603) 669-5139
Fax: (603) 624-0573